Prompt	What to look for	Notes
Was the committee	Did the meeting run to time?	Chair was aware of time and amount on agenda and signposted her
chaired effectively?		intention at the start of the meeting to prioritise more time to some
	Did the committee devote the right amount of time to	agenda items. This is the second meeting in succession I have
	the items listed? (ie. More time for the more	attended where we ran over and at the end of the meeting the Chair
	significant issues)	acknowledged that perhaps the amount of agenda items had been a little ambitious.
	Was the Chair well prepared for the meeting?	Chair was well prepared and everyone, including Governors had the opportunity to participate.
	Did everybody who wanted to participate get a	
	chance to do so? Note in particular if any member or	
	attendee appears to have been ignored or sidelined.	
	At the conclusion of every item, was there appropriate	I didn't think this was always as clear as it could have been.
	summing up and was it clear what the outcome of the	
	discussion was?	
	Was there appropriate intervention? For example, if	Intervention was appropriate and on topic.
	members strayed away from the topic or were	
	prolonging a discussion unnecessarily?	
Did the non-executive	Were the non-executive directors well prepared for	The NEDs were as always engaged, well prepared and had obviously
directors participate	the meeting? How familiar did they appear to be with	read the agenda and supporting documentation asking focussed and
effectively?	the detail in the papers or did they come across as not	pertinent questions across a range of agenda items.
	having read the papers?	
	Did they ask insightful questions about the items	
	under discussion?	
	Was there any non-participation/apparent disinterest	
	from a non-executive?	
	Were the NED inputs to discussions balanced across	
	all agenda items? [Some NEDs have a comfort zone	

Prompt	What to look for	Notes
	and they will spend more time discussing favourite	
	topics at the expense of issues that interest them less,	
	even if they are a bigger issue for the organisation)	
	Did any of the non-executive directors not challenge?	
Was there effective	Did the non-executives challenge appropriately? In	They frequently challenged in an appropriate manner.
challenge by the non-	other words, did they challenge on suitably material	
executives?	and significant issues or were they overly concerned	
	about trivial matters (eg. Spelling mistakes, immaterial	
	issues)	
	Were there any items discussed where you consider	No.
	that there could have been more challenge by the	NO.
	non-executives?	
	Heri executives.	
	Was the nature of the challenge constructive,	Very constructive comments made in an appropriate manner.
	supportive, non-confrontational and respectful or did	,
	it come across negatively (adversarial,	
	argumentative)?	
In general, was it a good meeting	Was the debate constructive, positive and respectful?	Yes and has been the case at all the meetings I have attended.
	Was there a general atmosphere of mutual trust and	Yes.
	candour?	
	March 2017 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 1	No estidado de Chica de Harra de Chica
	Was there any evidence of "group think"? This is a	No evidence of this, challenge and questioning came from all
	risky situation when groups become so collegiate and	quarters.
	complacent that all members start behaving in the	
	same way?	